DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 860 AC 002 851

By- Beran, D. L.

Community Development in Colleges and Universities of the United States.

Pub Date Jun 67
Note- 47p.
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $2.45
Descriptors- College Faculty, *Colleges, *Community Development, *Community Services, *Curriculum, Degree Requirements, Educational Philosophy, Graduate Study, Professional Recognition, Program Evaluation, Publications, Research, Social Sciences, Statistical Data, Surveys, Training, Undergraduate Study, *Universities

A study was made of curriculums in community development offered by colleges and universities. Of 41 institutions, twelve offered curriculum, 24 provided services, and six conducted training; two offered undergraduate and graduate preparation, six offered graduate preparation only, and two were mainly training oriented. Only four were involved in all three types of activities. There were no great differences in educational philosophy between course-oriented and service-oriented institutions and no clear pattern in the departmental locations of curriculums. Most faculty were professors or part-time professors; their academic backgrounds and degrees were largely in the social sciences, especially anthropology, sociology, and education. Students (largely graduate) reflected various human service backgrounds, but sociology and anthropology were the leading areas of undergraduate preparation. Degree and course requirements also were centered on the social sciences. Time, money, and staffing were the chief problem areas. Little writing, publishing or innovative planning was noted, however. Additional resources and further research in several areas were recommended. (ly)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

An introductory survey of the academic programs in Community Development of several colleges and universities of the United States of America

LIBRARY
309.24
FOR ADULT EDUCATION

By: D. L. Beran, Ph.D.
Professor and Coordinator
for International Training
in Community Development
Department of Regional and
Community Affairs
University of Missouri

ED024860

Ac 002 857

Published by
Department of Regional & Community Affairs
320 Professional Building, University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65201
June 1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is deeply indebted to Mr. E. Doyle Jackson who assisted in tabulating and interpreting the survey returns. He also is grateful to friends and colleagues, Arthur Dunham and E. Frederick List for their advice and suggestions during the planning stage of the project. To Dr. Lee J. Cary, Chairman of the Department of Regional and Community Affairs, the writer is especially grateful for his cooperation and enthusiastic support of the project.

Most appreciative of all is he to those who took the time out of busy schedules to provide the information without which this report could not have been possible.

D.L.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface 3

Chapter I. Introduction

- Background to the Study 9
- Purpose 12
- Procedure 12
- Limitations 13

Chapter II. Analysis of the Reports 14

Chapter III. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations 36

- Summary and Implications 36
- Recommendations 39

Appendices

1. Community Development Personnal, Colleges and Universities to Which Surveys Were Sent 43
2. Five Definitions of Community Development. 45

PREFACE

It has been some time since de Tocqueville wrote about "these peculiar Americans" who, when a citizen conceives of some need which is not being met, cause a committee to come into existence, "and then the committee begins functioning on behalf of that need and you won't believe this—but it is true—all of this is done without reference to any bureaucrat. All of this is done by the private citizens of their own initiative." All of what he observed in America in 1830 is equally true of America in the last half of this century and more particularly, with some paraphrasing, could be said of that area of human endeavor which we call Community Development.

Contrary to what the writer has heard from a limited few individuals whom he would choose to call either misinformed or illinformed, Community Development is a fairly lusty infant in the world today. In fact, it has moved out of a formative stage toward a position in which certain signs of maturity seem to be emerging. It may be true, as Alderfer has pointed out, that:

> Most of us will admit that community development has not yet achieved a specific professional discipline like some of the established professions and fields of learning. It is a curious, but for our time, a uniquely challenging emergent profession. The community development worker functions differently from a specialist because he is concerned with the whole spectrum of community life.[1]

Even so, at least one university in the U.S. offers a curriculum of advanced education in Community Development for which a Master's degree is granted upon the completion of sixty semester hours of interdisciplinary studies and in which the department offers forty-eight semester hours of course work in Community Development per se. Fourteen individuals have earned the Master's degree in this program in the last three years. Another acquaintance of the writer has an advanced degree which he reports as: "Ph.D. in Rural Sociology (Community Development)." Since the time of the Lackey Report (in 1960) which reported on academic programs in twelve institutions and even during the period of time in which the present report was being prepared and completed several new departments and services in Community Development at the university and college level have been either instituted or reorganized. In addition to all of this, the stream of letters from interested individuals who want to do advanced study in Community Development, from both domestic and foreign sources, is not only constantly expanding but has reached rather generous proportions. Without attempting to ascertain the causes for this continually expanding interest in and desire for advanced study in Community Development, the writer merely wishes to explore the opportunities available for the study and observation of Community Development.

[1]E. G. Alderfer. *Some Applications, Patterns and Premises of Community Development in Latin America.* Paper presented to SEATO CD Seminar in Bangkok, Thailand, July 1965.

In the foreword of the Lackey Report, which will be quoted in more detail later on, there was reference to the fact that: "Community Development in the American universities has been for some time not only a growing activity but one whose bounties, purposes, and methods have been exasperatingly ambiguous." What was true about this ambiguity is no less true now after seven years. All sorts of activities, programs, and approaches to community work are called Community Development. King includes under the term "Community Development" the community work of which de Tocqueville spoke, the "Community Organization" to which social workers refer as well as the "Community Action" of the so-called Anti-Poverty programs.[2] At the same time, one might very well consider the "definition to beware of" cited by Du Sautoy, "Community Development is an action taken by any agent and primarily designed to benefit the community."[3] There are those, however, who would uphold the virtue of ambiguity as Professor Lucien W. Pye has done:

> Community Development, like any political objective worthy of wide support, can mean many things to many people. Indeed, it would seem that one of the problems of community development is that it does not as yet mean enough different things to enough different people. The political leaders of those underdeveloped countries which have formally accepted the desirability of community development programs appear to recognize this problem and also the virtues of ambiguity. For as skilled politicians they know full well that excessive precision in proclaiming ends and means can lead to exclusiveness and even isolation, while an appropriate degree of fuzziness can open the doors to the many. Thus, for these politicians we can usually get a general sense of the importance of community development but not a very precise or rigorous definition of it.[4]

Paiva, and others like him, may be removing some of this ambiguity when they bring together compilations of the contents of various curricula and service programs.

Goals and Objectives of Community Development

1. The meeting of individual needs and the improving of social, economic, and cultural conditions in the community to maximize opportunities for growth and development.
2. The integration of individuals, groups, and communities into a national community for the individual country's enrichment.
3. The planning, implementation, and co-ordination of different services and the integration of such programs for meeting total needs of the community.

[2]Clarence King. *Working With People in Community Action.* New York: Association Press, 1965 p. 13 & 14.
[3]Peter Du Sautoy. *The Organization of a Community Development Program.* London: Oxford University Press, 1962 (p. 129).
[4]Lucien W. Pye, Professor of Political Science, Center for International Studies, MIT, "Community Development as a Part of Political Development", *Community Development Review,* No. 8, ICA/W March 1958, p. 1.

4. Educating of individuals, groups, and communities for change.
5. Education of individual capacity for solving problems and an increasing competency for continuing to learn from experiences for solving newer problems.
6. Education for self-help, initiative and local leadership.
7. Education for citizenship.
8. The democratic involvement of the whole community in meeting needs.[5]

It should also be observed that the written descriptions people submit are often not descriptive of actual operations. Thus, we might say that when we cloak our virtues in ambiguity there is a danger that Community Development may become, if it has not already done so, a catch-all or an umbrella under which any number of programs, projects, activities, and movements without a home, may be assembled.

One purpose of this report is to present a brief, if however incomplete, picture of what colleges and universities in the U.S. known to have an interest in Community Development academic programs, are doing about it.

As the report will reveal, there exist some academic programs in Community Development which lead to a degree. In other cases the college and university effort is directed to the end that services to communities are the major effort. The content of the curriculum and the types of services rendered in themselves contribute further to the confusion and ambiguity mentioned previously.

But it is not in content alone that problems arise. The methods themselves should be as varied as the content. King, for instance, says:

> The process of stimulating and organizing a community for action is older than history and has been practiced in many nations. Moses was adept at it, and so was Gandhi. It is a difficult art. No one has yet deduced from it a dependable set of scientific principles which can be taught by lectures or memorized from books. It must be learned by doing. Those most proficient in it have never stopped to record and analyze how they got their results. They have worked intuitively and probably could not explain exactly why or how they have proceeded.[6]

Or as he later explains:

> Almost without exception, village workers are trained in agriculture, cooperatives, cottage industry, adult literacy, home economics, and in other "content" fields of instruction. While there is widespread understanding of the need to train workers to help villagers acquire attitudes, concepts, and skills of effective participation in community problem solving, i.e., *the process of working with people in programs of planned change,* little or nothing is done about it. In effect, the training of multipurpose extension workers is confined to the technical skills... The case study

[5]Paiva, J.F.X. *A Comparative Study of Community Development and Community Organization with Implications for Training:* Unpublished Research Project, University of Missouri. August 1963, pp. 37-38.
[6]op. cit. pp. 14 & 15.

method is a relatively new one in the underdeveloped countries. The threat that seems to be implied to trainers who depart from the traditional lecture method to do more creative teaching seems to be as great in these countries as it is on American campuses.[7]

In the "Field Training Guide" for the Philippines' Community Development program, still another facet of the concern relative to the curriculum is voiced,

> *Subjects can be delineated according to topical areas of knowledge or according to functional problems to be dealt with.* It shows that informal adult education is functional and is concerned with solving the real-life problems of people not merely with abstract knowledge. An example is "Getting Along With Others" instead of "Principles of Applied Psychology."[8]

When examining the curriculum of Community Development one frequently encounters a reference to a so-called "Interdisciplinary Approach." In considering the content of the curriculum it is easy to become enamored with the interdisciplinary philosophy. But a distinction must be made as to whether this is merely presenting compartmentalized courses in several disciplines which may never mention Community Development during their entire length or whether an integrated approach is used. Unless the study in other disciplines is somehow made in such a way that its relevance and application to Community Development is constantly brought out, we may well raise the question as to whether there is any basis upon which to substantiate the choices of courses in this discipline as opposed to some others. We may well be duplicating the situation that was general in the early days of Community Development training where the Community Development worker was referred to as a "multipurpose" worker. Whereas then he was a multipurpose worker with respect to skills, we may be only reversing the direction and now attempting to be making him a multipurpose worker in general disciplines, thus failing to recognize that his basic involvement is neither with disciplines nor skills but the educational component of his responsibility.

Another dimension of Community Development that might conceivably be developed, is suggested by J. Martin Klotsche, chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee:

> "The University should do for the urbanized areas what the land grant colleges have done for the nation's farm population, taking the knowledge of a scholar into the community and extending the outreach of its influence to all phases of urban life...Neither the complexity nor the controversial nature of many of our urban problems should deter universities from developing new techniques and approaches. Creative innovation, rather than the performance of routine urban services is the special role of the university in urban extension."[9]

[7]op. cit. p. 150.
[8]PACD, *Curriculum and Methods.* Manila: Presidental Assistant for Community Development, 1965.
[9]Quoted from a report on Experimental Programs Assisted by the Ford Foundation, Urban Extension, October 1966, p. 1.

But with all our reservations about and our awareness of the areas in which we can be of service, we need to observe certain cautions as each of the previously quoted individuals has indicated. We need to make certain that there is a difference between helping people to help themselves and merely assisting in the development of activities which may or may not make a contribution to their overall well-being. There may be considerable virtue in acquiring broad funds of knowledge in several disciplines and there certainly is a need for any practitioner of Community Development to possess a breadth of perspective. But we do need to know how to identify the patterns of social behavior which enter the development process without at the same time forcing on others our own food habits, child rearing methods, or medicines. Dr. Carl Taylor used to say in his lectures and his discussions of Community Development that we Americans need to have a clearer knowledge of exactly what it was that has helped us grow and develop as a people and a nation and why we think and act and feel the way we do. Not so that we can transplant these theories and practices of ours lock, stock and barrel, but so that we can be in a better position to help other people and other peoples to analyze themselves.

There seem to be two paramount needs in the development of curriculum for Community Development. Previous to establishing courses of study and activities for implementation there seems to be a need to examine and remove, if possible, some of the ambiguities in the use of the term Community Development. While it will always be involved in considerable difference of interpretation, at least some decision can be made as to which of the theoretical levels to which Sanders[10] refers is the one to which we subscribe. It would seem that there could be some agreement as to whether it is the practitioner's theory of which we are primarily concerned or whether it is that of the social science discipline focusing "with a somewhat detached eye upon community development." Essentially what this demands of those who are to plan for and teach Community Development courses is to decide upon the objectives of the curriculum. If the decision is made that the curriculum is to be directed toward preparing the practitioner, then the understandings, the attitudes, and the skills upon which that curriculum is based, will take one direction. If, however, the theoretical level at which Community Development is approached is that of a social science discipline, then our understandings and possibly even our attitudes and skills, will take a different direction. In any event, however stated, unless those objectives are stated in behavioral terms, the "theories going into the main stream of community development will continue to reflect the uncoordinated state of the social sciences."

Once having removed at least the major ambiguities and having reached some area of understanding about our objectives the logical sequence would demand the establishment of the curriculum content itself. Here we need to look at the alternatives. Logically, there should develop from the objectives a sequence of courses each of which will make its contribution toward the development of

[10]Irvin T. Sanders. "Theories of Community Development", *Community Development Review.* No. 9, June 1958, p. 29.

one or more understandings or attitudes or skills. Often, however, in the development of curricula we see only a hodge-podge of courses, activities, and experiences which may or may not produce an individual capable of doing the work which the statement of objectives seems to indicate he should. While this has been endemic to the development of curriculum in other fields, there is no reason why a newly developing discipline such as Community Development should start out with this burden. Too, we should make sure that in the implementation and development of course sequences we do not arrive at a situation where we have an accumulation of individuals who have done advanced studies in other fields and who want to use the Community Development course as a forum to expound the knowledge which they have accumulated from studying in these specialized areas rather than teaching a course which is Community Development per se. Otherwise, we will have the courses and the individuals who teach them going in all directions without reference to the objectives but proceeding generally from "unwarranted assumptions to foregone conclusions." Should the curriculum and teaching that accompanies it follow this direction, the best we can hope for is widely dispersed efforts, all done in the name of Community Development, which lead nowhere and which some future "crash" program, financed either by the government or foundations, will have to try to correct.

A beginning needs to be made. The place to start seems to be to examine what the various curricula now provide. This leads to future inquiries, investigations of what is taught, how it is taught, evaluation of what is taught, and an evaluation of the relevance of all the preceding, to stated objectives, the theoretical levels, and the needs of the field.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Returning to the U.S. after several years overseas as a consultant in community development, the writer observed that numerous academic programs in Community Development in colleges and universities were in existence or at least reported to be in existence. Knowing that he was to participate in one of these programs as a teacher, it was only natural that such questions as to what was being taught, who was teaching Community Development, and for what positions students of Community Development were being prepared would come to mind. It was discovered that there was very little known. Lackey had made in 1960, a "descripive and analytical study of Community Development Programs and Community Services in selected institutions belonging to the National University Extension Association."[1] Twelve such programs were reported, as well as a mention of three others not a part of the NUEA,* namely: Chico State, Earlham College, and Prairie State College. This rather detailed sketch of twelve community development programs and services formed the core of the report and served to indicate something of the activities, curriculum, and functions of each of the programs. At a later date, a list (no date or place of origin shown) headed "NUEA Community Development and Services Operations List" indicated that twenty-seven colleges and universities were either offering an academic program or operating a service agency in Community Development.

Mr. Louis M. Miniclier, then Chief of the Community Development Division of the International Cooperation Administration, Washington, reported that there were twelve U.S. universities and colleges that "have cooperated in developing programs to meet the needs of Community Development participants sponsored by ICA."[2]

The writer also heard frequent reference to the so-called "Biddle List." This list contained the names of forty-nine colleges and universities in the U.S. reputed to be conducting Community Development academic programs. Though never fully substantiated, the list is presumed to have been developed by William W. Biddle.

During the 1965-66 school year the graduate training division of the Mott Program of the Flint Michigan Board of Education, under the direction of W. Fred Totten and with the assistance of Geoffrey Smith, Mott Program Intern,[3] surveyed 375 universities and colleges in the North Central Association in the U.S. for the purpose of determining what academic programs in Community De-

[1]Katharine Lackey. *Community Development Through University Extension.* Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University, 1960. Community Development Publication 3.

[2]Louis M. Miniclier. *Community Development Review.* Washington: ICA, June 1959. Volume 4, No. 2. pp. 1-7.

*NUEA—National University Extension Association.

[3]W. Fred Totten. *A Survey of Community Development in Colleges and Universities.* Flint, Michigan: Board of Education, 1966.

velopment were in existence or being contemplated. On the basis of 185 returns received, the survey reported that thirty-five out of the 185 had a Community Development department or division. Reporting institutions were grouped under four headings: Junior Colleges, Liberal Arts Colleges, Teachers Colleges, and Larger Universities. The thirty-five departments or divisions were distributed over eighteen states of the North Central Association.

In response to the question "Are you planning a Community Development Program for the future?" sixty-five institutions reported in the affirmative. Of the 150 schools which had reported no Community Development department or division in question one of the survey, twenty-seven however, indicated they were planning for such a department in the near future. In response to the question, "Do you consider Community Development to be a responsibility of your institution?" the following information was reported:[4]

Number of Institutions (By Type) Acknowledging Responsibility for Community Development

Type of Institution	Response To Question		
	Yes	No	No Comments
Junior College	19	5	2
Liberal Arts College	39	33	7
Teachers College	24	11	4
Large University	36	2	3
Totals	118	51	16

The report showed that sixty-four per cent of the institutions in all eighteen states were concerned about Community Development. It also showed that seventy-three per cent of the junior colleges showed concern and eighty-six per cent of the universities acknowledged institutional responsibility for Community Development. The fourth and fifth conclusions are of particular interest:[5]

> From these results it may be hypothesized that the broad range of clients served by larger universities with their many departments and schools, and by junior colleges with their essentially local base and diversity of offerings, sensitize these types of institutions to the varying needs of the community at large. The particularized educational objectives of the liberal arts college with stress on academic concerns and, to a lesser extent, of the teachers college with professional emphasis seem to make these institutions less sensitive to community needs.

[4]Ibid. p. 15.
[5]Ibid. p. 16-17.

Analysis by states indicates that there is a general acknowledgement of community development responsibility. At least fifty per cent of the institutions in all the states, except Arkansas and South Dakota, felt that they should be responsible for community development. The states forming parts of the megalopolis (alleged) from Milwaukee to Lake Erie seem to show an overwhelming concern for community development. The effects of gross urbanization seem to be related to the growing awareness of community development needs among institutions of higher learning.

There are other interests in Community Development in academic circles which should not go unnoticed. The Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. has an active and growing section on Community Development. At the last two annual conventions the discussions of the Community Development section, which was well attended, generated considerable interest. The Rural Department of the NEA has also indicated a contributing and developing interest in Community Development especially as it relates to the community education concept. Other professional associations also have departments or sections on Community Development, as for instance, the Rural Sociological Society. But it must be remembered, however, that Community Development presently is represented as a section or a department in some other larger professional association. While the interest on the part of the membership may be considerable, it is quite evident that primary allegiance is to the parent association with Community Development having a secondary place in interest and attendance. It would seem that by now Community Development has sufficient numbers of practitioners and interested individuals that it could afford an association of its own nationally as well as regionally.

Peter du Sautoy and T. R. Batten, both from the United Kingdom, have made a considerable contribution to the literature of Community Development. Without in any way wishing to detract from the enormous contribution these gentlemen have made it must be remembered, however, that much of what they write about training and education and development, is for African and Asian clientele and based largely on experiences in these areas of the world. There is interest in Community Development being shown in the development of newly emerging programs in the U.S. such as those at Humboldt State College in California, The Mott Graduate Program in Michigan, and the West Georgia College program. The foregoing would seem to indicate that considerable activity is going on in the field of Community Development. New programs are being developed, interest in the study of presently operating programs is expanding, and the potential for the services of individuals who have been trained as practitioners is most promising at the moment.

Purpose

The cover letter to the colleges and universities stated that the objective of the survey is to "bring ourselves up to date with the interest and activity that seems to be taking place in academic circles in Community Development." More specifically, answers to twenty-three questions were solicited. The questions were:

1. In what context does Community Development operate at your school?
2. Of what department, school or college, are Community Development course offerings a part?
3. What is the faculty status of the individuals on your Community Development staff?
4. With what other departments are the part-time staff affiliated?
5. What is the educational background of the Community Development faculty?
6. What are your plans for future expansion of staff?
7. What is your present enrollment in Community Development?
8. What is the background of your students?
9. What was the major field of under-graduate preparation of your students?
10. Does the curriculum in Community Development lead to a degree?
11. What are the total hours required to graduate?
12. To what degree does the curriculum lead?
13. In addition to course work what other requirements are stipulated?
14. What are the basic or required courses in the curriculum?
15. What electives or other courses are recommended?
16. Is a journal published by the department?
17. How frequently is it published?
18. What other publications are issued by the department?
19. What publications have been authored by the faculty?
20. What facilities are available for use by faculty and students?
21. What do you consider to be your major problem?
22. What plans do you have for a general expansion of your Community Development program?
23. What plans do you have for modification of your program?

Procedure

A thirteen-page questionnaire was sent to sixty-two universities and colleges. This list was derived from the various reports of academic programs to which reference was made in the Introduction. To these institutions were added names secured from news stories, articles from journals, and information provided in promotional brochures indicating a Community Development program was in operation or being contemplated.

Of the sixty-two questionnaires sent out, (see Appendix 1) returns were received from forty-one institutions. It was discovered that three institutions that had once offered a curriculum in Community Development were no longer doing so. No reasons were given for dropping it. Only a guess can be made, but in

some cases there seems to be a connection between dropping the department and the fact that an individual that had been closely identified with it had left the institution. We would hesitate to conclude, however, that this is always true.

Limitations

It was discovered that several of the institutions on the original list were not conducting academic programs as such, but were involved in the rendering of various kinds of services, either in the immediate community surrounding the institution or the state at large. Inasmuch as the primary objective of this study was to inquire into the curriculum offerings in Community Development and the factors and problems related specifically to academic programs in this field of study the analysis is limited to those colleges and universities which report such activity. A brief note is made of the other types of community development interest being pursued or promoted but it is not the purpose of this study to make an analysis of them.

All in all the experience points up the need for the development of a rather comprehensive directory of the colleges and universities in the United States which have an interest in Community Development so that reliable information is available as to which are offering academic programs, which are offering community services solely, and which are offering a combination of the two. Some beginnings toward this are made in the present study and as an outgrowth of it.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE REPORTS

Though never actually stated, there was an implied assumption that the sixty-two colleges and universities to which the surveys were sent provided academic studies in Community Development. The returns, however, proved this assumption invalid. The forty-one responses (66%) indicated that the community development activity fell into four categories of activity, namely: a curriculum leading to a degree, engagement in training programs, rendering of community development services, and no progam (or discontinued) of any kind. The analysis will concern itself primarily with those institutions offering a curriculum in Community Development.

The colleges and universities which offer a curriculum provide either a certificate, an undergraduate degree, a graduate degree, or elective courses in Community Development. Institutions which confine their community development activity to services are involved in such as:

Services

1. Develop and activate regional plans.
2. Publish research and survey results.
3. Serve as a "pilot" to demonstrate new methods and techniques of community and area improvement.
4. Provide adult education programs.
5. Offer Extension work.
6. Prepare leadership handbooks and guides.
7. Conduct community betterment competition.
8. Offer consultation services to communities.
9. Develop self-help planning in small communities.
10. Engage in city planning.
11. Provide cultural enrichment programs.
12. Conduct seminars and conferences on school and community.

Those schools which are involved primarily in training as a community development activity participate in such as: Peace Corps training, Vista training, Office of Economic Opportunity training programs.

Table I indicates that fourteen of the forty-one reporting have no programs. Three of these once had programs but were dropped with no reason given for the elimination. In the remaining twenty-seven institutions, twelve offer a curriculum, twenty-four provide services, and six are engaged in training activities. (These will total more than twenty-seven because some are engaged in more than one type of community development activity). Though it is known that some of these institutions offer occasional courses, it was not assumed from their replies that courses offered provided more than a general knowledge of Community Development. In addition to the twenty-four institutions reporting service programs, another twelve reported a curriculum or course work providing an area

TABLE I

Areas of Community Development Emphasis in Forty-one Colleges and Universities of the United States

NO.	INSTITUTION	TYPE OF ACTIVITY			REPORTING NO PROGRAM
		ACADEMIC	TRAINING	SERVICE	
1.	University of Alaska College, Alaska			X	
2.	Antioch College Yellow Springs, Ohio	Undergrad-uate			
3.	University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona	Graduate	X	X	
4.	Arizona State Univ. Tempe, Arizona				X
5.	Baldwin-Wallace College Berea, Ohio				X
6.	University of California Los Angeles, California		X	X	
7.	Chico State College Chico, California			X	
8.	Cornell University Ithaca, New York	Graduate			
9.	Earlham College Richmond, Indiana	Undergrad-uate			
10.	University of Georgia Athens, Georgia			X	
11.	Goddard College Plainfield, Vermont	Undergrad-uate		X	
12.	Glenville State College Glenville, West Virginia			X	
13.	University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii				X
14.	Harvard University Cambridge, Mass.				X
15.	Humboldt State College Arcata, California			X	
16.	Illinois College Jacksonville, Illinois	(Program No Longer in Existence)			
17.	University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois	(Program No Longer in Existence)			X

TABLE I Continued.

NO.	INSTITUTION	TYPE OF ACTIVITY			REPORTING NO PROGRAM
		ACADEMIC	TRAINING	SERVICE	
18.	University of Iowa Iowa City, Iowa			X	
19.	Iowa State University Ames, Iowa				X
20.	University of Maine Orono, Maine			X	
21.	Michigan State Univ. East Lansing, Michigan	Graduate & Undergraduate	X	X	
22.	University of Missouri Columbia, Missouri	Graduate	X	X	
23.	University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska			X	
24.	University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico		X	X	
25.	University of N. Dakota Bismark, North Dakota				X
26.	North Dakota State Fargo, North Dakota				X
27.	University of Oklahoma Norman, Oklahoma	Graduate		X	
28.	University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon				X
29.	University of N. Carolina Chapel Hill, N. Carolina				X
30.	Ohio University Athens, Ohio			X	
31.	San Bernadino Valley College San Bernadino, Calif.	(Program No Longer in Existence			X
32.	Stanford University Stanford, California	Graduate & Undergraduate		X	
33.	Southern Illinois Univ. Carbondale, Ill.	Graduate		X	
34.	University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee			X	

TABLE I Continued.

NO.	INSTITUTION	TYPE OF ACTIVITY			REPORTING NO PROGRAM
		ACADEMIC	TRAINING	SERVICE	
35.	University of Texas Austin, Texas				X
36.	University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah	No Report From Dept. Which Handles Curriculum		X	
37.	Virginia Polytechnic Inst. Blacksburg, Virgina			X	
38.	Virginia State College Norfolk Division Norfolk, Virginia	Graduate	X	X	
39.	University of Washington Seattle, Washington			X	
40.	University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin			X	
41.	University of Wisconsin Milwaukee, Wisconsin				X

of concentration, and it is known that one other institution not reporting has a curriculum.[1]

Three of the institutions reporting course work were undergraduate liberal arts colleges, and their reports indicated that their curricula provided an emphasis rather than a major or minor subject area. Though it was indicated that community activities were engaged in by the students as a part of the individual course offerings, only one of the three reported the college was directly engaged in service activities.

Table II shows the situation existing in the twenty-seven institutions offering academic, training, and/or service programs. Of the twelve institutions offering course work, two offered both graduate and undergraduate preparation, nine offered graduate preparation, and two reported being primarily oriented to training programs.

Only Arizona (Tucson), Missouri (Columbia), Virginia State (Norfolk), and Michigan State reported involvement in all three types of community development activities: Services, Curriculum, and Training.[2]

[1]At the University of Utah, classes in Community Development were reported being taught in the Department of Sociology but no further details were supplied. The Mott Program of the Flint, Michigan Board of Education also has a graduate training program in Community Education in cooperation with Eastern Michigan and Michigan State Universities.

[2]It was indicated, however, that Utah may also be engaged in all three areas even though a complete report was not submitted.

TABLE II

Types of Community Development Activities in Twenty-seven Colleges and Universities of the United States.

NO.	INSTITUTION	SERVICE	CURRICULUM		TRAINING
			UNDERGRADUATE	GRADUATE	
1.	Alaska	X			
2.	Antioch		X		
3.	Arizona - Tucson	X		X	X
4.	U.C.L.A.	X			X
5.	Chico State	X			
6.	Cornell			X	
7.	Earlham		X		
8.	Georgia	X			
9.	Goddard College	X	X		
10.	Glenville State	X			
11.	Humboldt State	X			
12.	University of Iowa	X			
13.	Maine	X			
14.	Michigan State	X	X	X	X
15.	Nebraska	X			
16.	Missouri	X		X	X
17.	New Mexico	X			X
18.	Oklahoma	X		X	
19.	Ohio	X			
20.	Southern Illinois Univ.	X		X	
21.	Stanford	X	X	X	
22.	Tennessee	X			
23.	Utah	X		X	
24.	Virginia Polytechnic	X			
25.	Virginia State (Norfolk)	X		X	X
26.	Washington	X			
27.	Wisconsin (Madison)	X			

To determine, if possible, the context in which the community development activities of a college or university operate, the respondents were asked to choose from among five universally known definitions. (See Appendix 2). If they approved or accepted none of these, they were encouraged to supply their own. Table III indicates that the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) and Cambridge Conference definitions were checked most often. Twenty-five of the forty-one reporting institutions responded to this question but the total is larger because in certain cases two definitions were chosen.

Four other definitions were submitted. Of these, the document, *A Holistic Approach To Community Development,* by Alchin, Donoghue, Ishino, and Marquis (Michigan State), was noteworthy, though because of its length no attempt is made here to summarize it. It is suggested that each institution engaged in Community Development have a copy in its library, however.

TABLE III

Definitions of Community Development Selected by Twenty-Five of Forty-One Reporting Colleges and Universites.

Definition	Type of Department		Total
	Academic	Service	
1. A.I.D.	6*	6*	12
2. Cambridge Conference	4	3	7
3. No Preference	1	3	4
4. Other	2*	1	3
5. United Nations	0	1*	1
6. Ashridge	0	0	0
7. Philippine	0	0	0
Total	13*	14*	27

***In certain cases an institution selected more than one definition.**

The philosophy of Community Development submitted by the reporting institutions was generally reported as statements of principles. For this reason, they are summarized as a series of Principles of Community Development rather than as individual philosophies. Using Dunham's models, with some modifications, the following twenty statements of philosophy indicate the numbers of times the reporting institutions mentioned them.[3]

[3]Arthur Dunham. *Some Principles of Community Development,* Columbia; Department of Community Development, University of Missouri, 1963.

TABLE IV

Community Development Philosophy Expressed by Fifteen Colleges and Universities

	ITEMS	NO.
1.	Community Development is a democratic process and should be instituted in a democratic manner.	8
2.	Community Development is of necessity a self-help process.	6
3.	Educational process is essential to instigation and completion of the Community Development process.	6
4.	Community Development should be based on the felt-needs of the community.	5
5.	Community Development should be based on the political, social, economic, and physical needs of the community.— Holistic Approach	5
6.	The ultimate aim of Community Development is to build people.	5
7.	The Community Development process must be initiated from outside if the community is unwilling to initiate it.	3
8.	Community Development should be initiated and guided by a trained responsible worker.	3
9.	One of the basic functions of the community development program is the demonstration that change may be safely made.	3
10.	The local community should be the basic unit of the community development process.	4
11.	Community development programs, to be successful, should be well organized, integrated, practical, realistic, flexible, and stimulating.	3
12.	Community development should be the adaptation of change to society.	2
13.	Community Development should utilize all possible resources, especially governmental assistance.	2
14.	There is no one approach to community development, instead all approaches should be considered in any single situation.	2
15.	Local voluntary leadership should be encouraged and stimulated in the community development process.	2
16.	Community Development should be concerned with total community.	2
17.	The Community Development program and process should be given equal weight.	1
18.	Good communication is one of the needs and one of the results of the community development process.	1
19.	Community Development is a method which involves people in a systematic problem-solving process.	1
20.	An enlightened citizenry and a responsible government should be the result of community development.	1
		65

Ten of the twelve institutions reporting substantial curriculum or course work, and five of the thirteen institutions reporting only service functions made statements of their philosophy. Since there seemed to be no appreciable difference in philosophy between the two types of institutions, no distinction in reporting institutions is made in Table IV.

There is, however, an interesting discrepancy existing between the statements of philosophy of the same institution. For example, two institutions report that community development is a democratic process and should be instituted in a democratic manner (in statement 1) yet also state that community development must be initiated from the outside if the community is unwilling to initiate it (in statement 7). Seemingly contradictory, these two, and similarly other statements need further elaboration than was generally acquired by this survey. Because of the brevity of the statements it was difficult to tell if a basic discrepancy did exist in fact, or if it only appeared to exist.

The second major question of the survey sought to discover whether or not a pattern of deparmental placement existed in the places where Community Development courses were offered. Table V shows this distribution but from the fourteen colleges and universities which responded to this question no pattern can be said to exist. In five institutions Community Development is part of a social science department, in two Community Development is in a department of its own and in the rest of the cases it is an activity in some other department or branch of the university.

TABLE V

Departmental Locations of Community Development Curriculum

DEPARTMENTS	NO.
Sociology	3
Sociology and Anthropology	2
Community Development Department	2
Courses Offered in Various Departments	2
Adult Education	1
Jointly With Other Departments	1
Arts and Science	1

Because of the variety of departmental locations for Community Development in the twelve institutions having substantial curriculum or course work, it is difficult to ascertain the numbers, ranks, and specialties of the faculty. In some cases it was obvious that faculty from other departments or entities were closely involved with the Community Development academic program, while in others it was equally obvious that service personnel were carried as a part of the academic staff. Because of these and other considerations, the numbers, ranks, and

specialties of the various faculties given may not be toc informative. Table VI is therefore presented with these limitations in mind.

Of the twelve institutions reporting academic programs of various types, only nine are summarized (Table VI). The balance may or may not have a faculty but since the returns were incomplete, nothing more can be concluded from them.

TABLE VI

Academic Rank of Community Development Faculty

RANK	NUMBER OF FACULTY
Professor	12
Associate Professor	8
Assistant Professor	4
Visiting Professor	1
Instructor	6
Graduate Assistant	10
Part-time Professors	29
TOTAL	70

Nine schools reported a total of seventy faculty members, including ten graduate assistants.

Of the twelve colleges and universities which did report a Community Development curriculum in operation, Table VII reveals that in ten of these the faculty came from a variety of academic backgrounds but most frequently from the social sciences.

TABLE VII

Academic Background of Community Development Faculty*

AREA OF STUDY	NUMBER
Anthropology	17
Sociology	17
Education	12
Economics	9
Agriculture	6
Political Science	5
Rural Sociology	5
Geography	4
Social Work	3
Architecture	3
Law, Architecture, Engineering	3
History	2
Social Science	2
Regional and City Planning	2
Civil Engineering	1
Adult Education	1

The total will be greater than that shown in Table VI since several reported more than one academic area.

Table VIII indicates the earned degrees of the Community Development faculty members in ten colleges and universities reporting a curriculum. Obviously the background of the faculty is varied and, except for an apparent concentration in the social sciences, follows no prevailing pattern. It would be difficult from this to conclude, however, that any one field of academic background is any more useful than another.

TABLE VIII

Degrees Earned By Community Development Faculty Members

	Type of Degree Earned*			
Area of Study	Bachelor	Master	Ph.D.	Ed.D.
Anthropology	4	8	6	
Education	2	8	4	3
Sociology	7	3	6	
Economics	4	3	2	
Political Science	3	3		
Agriculture	3	1		
Rural Sociology	1	2	5	
Social Work	1	2	1	
Adult Education	2	1		1
Psychology	1	1	2	
Social Science		1	1	
Urban Studies	1	1		
Geography	2	1	1	
Architecture	2	1		
Law, Architecture, Eng.	3	3	2	
History		2		
Regional and City Planning		2		
Civil Engineering	1			
English	1			

*Will equal more than totals of previous tables since all degrees earned by an individual are reported.

The sixth question asked was, "What are your plans for future expansion of staff?" Of the twelve reporting colleges and universities which offer a curriculum in Community Development, only four indicated any such plans. Three planned to add one person, one university intended adding two faculty members; all of which were to be full-time appointments. Eight of the twelve institutions having curriculum or courses in Community Development reported on the number of students in their program, and all were primarily concerned with graduate training. The number and categories of students enrolled are shown in Table IX.

TABLE IX

Distribution of Students in Eight Colleges and Universities Offering a Community Development Curriculum

Type of Curriculum	Place of Origin of Students		Totals
	U.S.	Other Countries	
Undergraduate	3	0	3
Graduate	102	18	120
Graduate Minor	13	2	15
Special Training	80	14	94
Totals	198	34	232

The experience of the students may or may not be meaningful. Since they come from only eight colleges and universities the number may be too small to even indicate a trend but it is possible to discern from Table X the sort of experiences students now enrolled in Community Development bring to their study as background. The experiences are varied and one may observe that most students have come from situations in which human relationships are a principal concern.

TABLE X

Background Experiences of Community Development Students

EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS
Private Agency	63
Govt. Agency in Community Development	33
Teacher	25
Social Worker	20
Peace Corps	16
VISTA	7
Civil Rights	6
Other	6
Community Developmnet Agent	5
Extension Agent	5
Missionary	4
Field Studies	2
Clinical Psychologist	1
Clergy	1

Closely related to the background experiences of the students in Community Development is their undergraduate preparation. Together the two present a profile of the sort of persons we can expect to find pursuing a study of Community Development. Table XI indicates that the students of Community Development come from a diversity of academic backgrounds. While the largest number come from two fields, Sociology and Education, the remaining one-hundred-fourteen reported come from twenty-four other areas of study. One might observe from this that Community Development is a field of study that attracts students of a variety of interests and backgrounds.

TABLE XI

Undergraduate Preparation of Students in Community Development

Major Field of Preparation	Number of Students
1. Sociology	35
2. Education	27
3. Anthropology	13
4. Agriculture	12
5. General Studies	12
6. Social Work	10
7. Political Science	7
8. Architecture	6
9. Economics	5
10. Psychology	4
11. Geography	3
12. Theology	3
13. Law	3
14. Engineering	3
15. Fine Arts	3
16. Business Administration	2
17. Biology	2
18. Rural Sociology	2
19. Urban Planning	2
20. Journalism	1
21. Recreation	1
22. Nursing	1
23. Resource Development	1
24. Asian Studies	1
25. History	1
26. Unidentified	16

Questions ten to twelve deal with the type of degrees granted and the hours required to complete the Community Development study. In Table XII is shown the resume of what is being done in eight of the twelve colleges and universities offering a Community Development curriculum. In six, a graduate degree is granted, though in only two instances is the degree specifically in *Community*

TABLE XII

Types of Community Development Curriculum

SCHOOL	DEGREE*				TOTAL HOURS		TITLE OF DEGREE
	U.G.	GR.	D.	C.	U.G.	GR.	
I		X				30 + Intern Semester	Major in Sociology or Anthro.; Master's degree in Sociology or Anthro.; possible to earn Ph.D.
II		X				60 Semester	M.S. in Community Development
III		X				Not Specified	Major in Rural Soc. at M.S. level; Minor in Rural Soc. at M.S. or Ph.D. level; Master's degree in Rural Sociology
IV		X				54 Semester	Master's Degree in Regional-City Planning
V		X		X		45 Quarter	Master's degree in Anthro., Sociology, or Social Science
VI				X	9		Major in Education; Minor in Sociology
VII	X				8 Semesters		A.B. degree possible under individually planned curriculum
VIII		X				48 Quarter	Master's degree in Community Development

*U.G. = Undergraduate; G = Graduate; D = Diploma; C = Certificate

Development. In one case the degree is in *Regional and City Planning;* in the remaining it is a master's degree in a social science. The number of hours required to complete the degree ranged from one where no specified number of hours was stated to another requiring sixty semester hours.

None of the institutions offering certificated programs reported the title of their certificate, except for one that indicated it was part of a VISTA training program.

Seven institutions have requirements other than or in addition to the completion of courses in Community Development. These are shown in Table XIII. It will be seen that in five of the seven reporting, a thesis was required. In some cases both an oral and written examination is required as a prerequisite to graduation. It is interesting to observe that *field work was not a universal requirement.*

Specific course requirements in the different institutions also varied considerably. Considering the same seven institutions listed in Table XIII, each had a substantially different set of course requirements in their Community Development curriculum. Because the variance in describing and listing courses was con-

TABLE XIII

Other Requirements in Partial Fulfillment Of a Degree in Community Development

REQUIREMENTS	INSTITUTION							TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
Thesis	X	X	X	X			X	5
Seminar Report (in lieu of thesis)						X		1
Research Report (in lieu of thesis)		X			X		X	3
Oral Examination	X	X	X				X	4
Written Examination	X	X	X		X			4
Field Work		X		X	X			3
Internship Report	X							1
Field logbook	X							1
Field Studies & Research Studies				X				1

siderable, only the basic and elective courses are indicated in Table XIV. No pattern can be observed to emerge except that there is a high concentration on courses in the field of social science. Probably most impressive is what is absent: only one course on Human Relations, no courses of Adult Learning or Human Abilities and Learning, none on Social Issues in Education; nothing on Evaluation, Supervision, Training or Administration. One institution offers a course in Program Planning.

TABLE XIV

Courses in the Community Development Curriculum of Seven Reporting Universities and Colleges.

Basic Courses	HOURS REQUIRED BY INSTITUTIONS*						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Major Dept. Courses leading to M.A. to include:	30				Quarter Hours		Quarter Hours
Comparative Community Organization & Development	6		Not Specified	Not Specified			
Community Development Internship	2-6						7
Theory & Principles of Community Development		5			5 (Q)	3	
Change Agent in Planned Change							3
Community Development Process		3					
Seminars I & II		6					4-6
Community & Area Planning		3					
Urban Community Development		3					
Action Research		3					
Field Experience		12					
Research Methods					5 (Q)		
Field Research		3			12 (Q)		3
Advanced Community Develop.						3	
Application of Sociology to Development Programs			3				
Program Planning			3				
Applied Anthropology			4				
Independent Study							3
Elective Courses							
Applied Anthropology	3	3					
Comparative Soc. Org.	3						
Modern Communities	3	3					
Methods in Cultural Anthropology	3						
Economic Life of Primitive Peoples	3						

TABLE XIV Continued.

Basic Courses	HOURS REQUIRED BY INSTITUTIONS*						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Social Relations in Metropolitan	3						
Minority Relations	3						
Community Research Prob.	3						
Government Social Policy & Institutional Resources		3					
Group & Interpersonal Competence		3					
Human Relations						3	
Anthropology							7
Free Choice on Advice of Instructor			For Balance required				
Education							6
Psychology							8
Social Anthropology					3		4
Rural Sociology					3		
Urban Sociology					3		
Urban Planning					3		
Development Economics					3		
Political Science				9			28
Economics				6-9			16
Sociology				6-9			20
Geography				3-6			8
History				3-6			
From Other Disciplines		15-30					
Geog. & Area Development, Economics, Govt. Psychology	30						

*All hours are semester hours except for Institution "E" and "G".

From the reports of nine of the twelve colleges and universities having a curriculum in Community Development there is an indication of little writing being done by the Community Development faculty or publication of materials by the department.

Two departments of Community Development issue a newsletter, two have issued an article each describing their approach to Community Development, two institutions have issued three pamphlets which are in the nature of a handbook or guide, one has issued four community studies or surveys, one a bibliography, and one reports that it produces research and planning studies.

Research and publication on the part of the faculty members is rather limited if one is to judge by the replies received from nine of the twelve colleges and universities reporting a curriculum in Community Development. Table VI indicated that in nine of the reporting institutions there were seventy on the faculty. From these seventy faculty members there emerged a total of twenty-one publications. Eight professors each published one article, one published two articles, one had three, and one, five. Two professors collaborated on each of two other publications, and on one other, four professors shared in the production.

Eight institutions reported on the facilities available to conduct a Community Development curriculum. Facilities available are shown in Table XV. Of the ten different types of facilities listed, one school had eight in use, one institution had six available for its use; in four instances, the facilities were shared by other departments; in one school, six of the nine were available for use by the department; one had three, and three schools had three of the nine types of facilities available for use in Community Development. As Table XV shows, a conference room is usually provided as is a library while other aids such as a collection of films and an instructional materials center falls somewhat short of being generally used.

TABLE XV

Facilities Available for Curriculum Implementation

FACILITY	NO. HAVING IT
Conference Room	7
Library	5
Film Collection	5
Materials Center	4
Lounge	4
Research Center	4
Transportation	3
Museum	1
Adult Education Center	1
Camp for Work & Group Experiences	1

Questions twenty-one, twenty-two and twenty-three, asked for a statement of the problems, expansion, and curriculum modification plans of the colleges and universities engaged in teaching community development. Ten institutions reported a total of thirty-seven in the frequency indicated below in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI

Problems Related to Community Development Curriculum Implementation

	ITEM	NO. REPORTING
1.	Need Staff	5
2.	Need Money - general	4
3.	Not enough time for programs	3
4.	Need space - general	2
5.	Need facilities	2
6.	Money for graduate assistants	2
7.	Need more research in community planning and development	2
8.	Program is over extended in terms of time, space, money, etc.	2
9.	Feel too much pressure to participate in new programs	2
10.	Lack full time direction	1
11.	Students pressured for time	1
12.	Poor participation by institution in program	1
13.	Program not allowed to be innovative enough	1
14.	Program has few achievements	1
15.	Program has difficulty in working with communities' problems	1
16.	Need greater coordination of community development materials for training	1
17.	Need more time for public relations	1
18.	Need more time to prepare instructional materials	1
19.	Need better field experience and supervision program	1
20.	Finding difficulty in recruiting new staff	1
21.	Need better public relations	1
22.	Need to establish a philosophy and organizational structure of service program acceptable to institution	1

Directly related to these problems are the eight comments under the expansion or modification of program categories which were indicated by the institutions as being a solution or partial solution of their problems.

Changes Necessary to Meet Problems

1. Presently adding to new technical staff members.
2. One new staff member will be added in each year—1967 and 1968 and three additional staff positions are currently being planned.
3. A general expansion of staff is presently under way.
4. Six new graduate fellowships have been acquired.
5. Efforts have generally been expanded in research, demonstration and short courses.
6. A coordinator has been appointed to handle community development teaching materials.
7. Better uses of students and their time are being developed.
8. Allowing a wider acceptance of field experience by accepting other relevant experiences.

A scattering of twenty-four expansion or modification plans, as indicated in the list that follows, tends to give some insight into the day to day progress relating to the implementation of the Community Development curriculum.

From the problems listed in Table XVI and the changes relevant to these problems several needs seem obvious. First is the universally expressed need to expand programs, both service and academic. Along with this expansion goes the inevitable problem of allocation of scarce resources; in this case, staff, time, money, space, and facilities. Of the more than fifty statements cited, only a few do not seem directly related to these resources, and most are indirectly related. This need for program expansion does not seem related solely to either service or instructional programs, but was felt by all respondents reporting programs at this time. This seemingly general need for expansion leads one to wonder again why the three programs which once existed, but have now been discontinued, should have ceased when the overall attention to Community Development seems to be undergoing general expansion.

Plans for Modification or Expansion of the Community Development Curriculum and its Related Aspects

1. More appointments to staff and a larger staff.
2. Closer liaison of service with agricultural extension.
3. Establish a broader financial base for program.
4. Develop a Community Development course or curriculum.
5. Expanding self-help planning for small communities.
6. Expanding service program by five technical consultants and two secretaries.
7. Using television to reach more people in the communities.
8. Using local elementary school principals to reach more people.
9. Adding a full time coordinator for off-campus service programs.

10. Expanding a program to eventually cover one-third of the state.
11. Placing a greater emphasis on development education for domestic use.
12. Increasing staff to handle fifty additional students in 1968-69 school year.
13. Development of a Doctoral program in Community Development in the near future.
14. Adding an additional semester program to undergraduate area.
15. Developing field experience further in U.S. and in foreign countries.
16. Expanding VISTA training programs.
17. Initiating A.I.D. contract programs.
18. Increasing work with private foundations, especially those connected with poverty programs.
19. Placing more emphasis on economic development in service program.
20. Adding a recreation consultant to service program.
21. Developing better tie-ins with service and community resources.
22. Developing greater coordination with community voluntary agencies.
23. Undergoing critical evaluation of curriculum, field experiences, and departmental policies and administration.
24. Moving toward offering academic degree as a social science degree.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It seems quite obvious after having looked over the information from the reporting institutions that consideration and review of university level Community Development curriculum is a necessity. It is equally obvious that certain inadequacies were present in the survey form. Notwithstanding, there is much to be gained from this preliminary exploration of the content and approach being presently employed in Community Development teaching.

Quantitatively speaking, the report is not very impressive. But where there is only a limited amount of activity there can only be a resultant limit to what can be reported about it. For the most part, the information secured represents considerably more than had been available to the writer previously. Inasmuch as a beginning always has to be made, it would seem that the information summarized is significant to the degree that it provides some base-line knowledge from which other more detailed investigations may proceed.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The summary statements, and accompanying conclusions that follow are grouped under four headings. Each of these might very well become the subject of further detailed inquiry and investigation:

Philosophy
Organization and Administration
Curriculum
Professional Activity

Again, it must be reiterated that the intent was to study only the Community Development activity in those colleges and universities which offer an academic study program. While some information about institutions offering Community Development services exclusively was procured, it is not considered the intent or responsibility of this report to concentrate on that.

One fact seems quite obvious from the entire accumulation of information. This is that only twelve of forty-one colleges and universities reporting are providing a course of study in Community Development. While this may seem to be an unimpressive figure it does represent a state of being which has been established and from which a start can be made in future studies.

The more interesting and noticeable revelations produced by the survey seem to be:

Philosophy

1. Most institutions offering a curriculum in Community Development (nine of twelve reporting) report an acceptance or adherence to one or another of several well-known definitions. This unanimity with respect to definition, does not exist, however, in the service institutions—here only five out of the twenty-three indicated a choice of, or statement of, Community

Development definition. This may explain somewhat, the presence of so many different kinds of activities presently being offered in and under the name of "Community Development."

2. In the twelve departments reporting Community Development curricula, most were a part of or closely related to a social science department. In only one case was the Community Development department an autonomous department operating with its own staff and curriculum. One might begin to wonder, therefore, whether or not Community Development is regarded as or even approaches being considered an independent and self-sustaining area of study. Certainly one might very well enter into study and discussions of what is the true place of Community Development.

Organization—Administration

1. The returns show that in most cases Community Development is closely related to if not actually within, an already established social science or adult education department of the college or university. Most of the faculty come from these same departments and most faculty members report the social sciences as their major area of study. Since this is true one can but wonder whether Community Development then becomes merely an "applied" social science or whether or not it is regarded as an area of study with literature, techniques and practices unique to itself.
2. Supplementary to the preceding is the fact that in the schools where a graduate degree is granted, *only two* grant a degree in Community Development as such. It is also interesting to note that only one university has a Department of Community Development that is autonomous in both curriculum and faculty. (Both of which are inter-disciplinary)
3. In most cases Community Development is a graduate level study. The question might very well be raised concerning the desirability of this. Is not Community Development of such importance in the ongoing preparation for life that it should be offered to undergraduate students as well who need the viewpoint and concepts which Community Development has to offer?
4. The information about facilities seems not very conclusive but there seems to be an undercurrent of unconcern about the facilities necessary for a Community Development education program. There is the tendency to conclude that in the institutions where Community Development is being taught there is no deeply felt need for, or great utilization of such supporting services as a camp, a departmental library and reading room, instructional materials library and production center, and communications media library and production center. One would rather suspect that a great deal of the teaching that goes on, therefore, would be limited to either lectures or discussions without very much utilization of, or dependence upon the other types of materials and resources the practitioner needs to use to work effectively in the field.

Curriculum

1. Note should be made of the fact that most of the students of Community Development seem to come from a background of experiences in which human relationships are a central item. It would seem then, that the curriculum would reflect this concern with people in a more tangible way than it does. Only a few courses reflect an emphasis on the more practical aspects of Community Development. Most seem to assume that an accumulation of knowledge in a traditional college course will prepare an individual for the various functions which he performs as a practitioner in Community Development. The experience of others would seem to suggest this may not be true and that the courses should be built more around functions than around traditional organizations of knowledge.
2. It seems significant, by default, that there are no courses in Adult Learning, Supervision, Training, Evaluation, and Administration of Community Development. One might conclude from this that it gives support to a contention that as presently conceived the study of Community Development is an academic exercise and not too closely associated with the realities and requirements of a dynamic and rigorous field program.
3. Despite the apparent acceptance of a philosophy which proclaims a belief in the growth and development of the human being, there seems to be little attention in any of the curriculum offerings to "cultural enrichment." Most of the time the emphasis seems to be on physical planning, economic development, and citizen participation. Only one Community Development department reports such activities as: Concert Artists performances, Mental Health Institutes, Drama Symposium, and Poetry reading in schools as an associated activity. One other graduate program reports a concentration on the role of the school as a stimulator and leader in Community Development.
   It would seem appropriate that the Community Development curriculum reflect more of its expressed belief in "broadening the perspective" than it seems to be doing presently.
4. While the results divulged no deluge of creative or innovative curriculum experimentation, one proposed modification seems worthy of special mention. In the hope that it may inspire further changes it is included in its entirety as an example of a development of promise.

   > Instead of a proliferation of separate course offerings in CD, we are planning to institute a sequential seminar which will be offered each quarter (starting in the fall), and affording 16-20 units of credit upon completion of the sequence.
   >
   > Each seminar offering will have a different content emphasis, such as:
   >
   > Historical and Comparative CD
   > Classical and Modern Theories of Social Change
   > CD Models for Urban and Rural Settings
   > CD Methods and Practices
   > Community Study and Research Methods

Professional Activity

1. Not a great deal of writing or publishing seems to be going on. Table VI reports some seventy full or part-time teachers of Community Development, excluding the graduate assistants. Yet this group of people produced but twenty-one publications in the past two years. Of this writing that has been done, not many of the titles would indicate concern and experimentation with curriculum, teaching techniques, or course content.
2. The fact that there is to date no professional organization of Community Development teachers and no professional journal would lead one to question the reasons for this absence and to suggest that here might be a fruitful area for exploration..
3. An examination of Table XVI reveals several problems of curriculum implementation supporting the contention that curriculum research is needed. Eight of twenty-three items listed as problems are definitely ones which can be researched and whose chief concern is with the curriculum per se.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Aside from the changes and improvements accompanying the previous summarizations, there are indications of certain needed developments and research emerging from the present study. These would seem to be in two parts: Actions or resources that could be initiated or developed; and further research on curriculum, instructional procedures, and experimentation.

RESOURCES

1. There seems to be a need for a *Clearing House* of Community Development resources. (for training, observation, materials, directory, etc.)
2. A Professional Journal devoted exclusively to Community Development is needed.
3. There is sufficient interest and activity to warrant the organization of a Community Development Professional Society.
4. There is cause to inquire into the extent to which programmed instuctional resources are employed in Community Development education.

RESEARCH

The several suggestions for necessary inquiry fall into four sections. Some areas for research are listed under each one.

Philosophy and Theory

1. Evaluation of curriculum and services based on criteria is suggested by various statements of philosophy and principles.
2. A determination of whether or not there exists a specific body of academic knowledge that can be deemed necessary to the preparation of a Community Development practitioner seems imperative. Our tendency is to as-

sume that the Community Development practitioner proceeds to function in the process of problem-solving in a somewhat unchanging role whereas groups move in a continuum toward sophistication from a formative level of growth and development to a stage of maturity. What if any, variations of procedure need to be determined for various levels along this continuum?

3. We say we utilize the knowledge of economics, of political science, anthropology, psychology, and sociology in Community Development. Obviously all the knowledge, theory and principles of these fields is neither applicable nor usable in Community Development. What is and what is not? Do students come to see these relationships? What attitudes and skills from these disciplines also have relevance for the Community Development practitioner? What mechanisms have been developed to verify that the student possesses these necessary understandings, attitudes, and skills?
4. We have always assumed that people will work best and will maintain the results of activities which are an expression of their felt needs. At the same time we have tended to feel that in the process of inducing needs, people are apt to engage in activities which they may not continue to support in the future. It might be worth our while to do some research in this direction to discover whether or not this is true.

Curriculum

1. A critical analysis and evaluation of the several courses being offered in the Community Development curriculum would provide us with considerable knowledge that is necessary if the practitioner in Community Development is to achieve his utmost effectiveness. Have we any evidence to substantiate that the product of a series of courses in the social sciences, for instance, will be any more effective in preparing a student to do Community Development work than to sample widely from some other combinations such as vocational agriculture, adult education, philosophy, ethics, and logic?
2. Selected Community Development and community action programs and projects could be examined in the light of stated principles and philosophy to determine the extent to which the curriculum may or may not be preparing to meet these needs.
3. A critical examination is needed of the degree to which our stated objectives are being realized through the implementation devices and procedures being either taught, emphasized or promoted. Are the hoped for understandings, attitudes, and skills realistic? Are they consistent with problems in the field? Are the practices and approaches workable or merely untested theory?
4. An investigation should be made to discover whether or not those who are teaching Community Development are knowledgeable on the basis

of first-hand field experience or whether their knowledge of Community Development is achieved primarily through the literature of this or some related field?

5. What is the content of the various courses presently being offered as partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree in Community Development?
6. How much value is there in the so-called "Inter-disciplinary" approach? Is it truly inter-disciplinary or does the curriculum merely present a cafeteria style offering of courses in several disciplines?
7. What approach is most effective in Community Development teaching? What are the relative merits of the lecture method as opposed to small group discussions and case studies? To what extent and how effective is the utilization of team teaching?
8. To what extent can much or most of what is being taught in Community Development be acquired through programmed instruction? What body of knowledge should be accumulated as a result of advanced study in Community Development?

Professional Activity

1. Are Community Development workers who live in the area where they work more effective than those who live outside the area?
2. What is required of those who are currently employed in the field of Community Development? Are the skills and knowledge required more along the line of practitioner or as a teacher?

Organization and Administration

1. Are Community Development departments and services expanding? What is the nature of this expansion? What are the problems associated with it? Why have certain colleges and universities discontinued either their curriculum or services in Community Development?
2. Although the intent of the present study was limited to an investigation of the curriculum and academic programs in existence, the returns revealed that various Community Development services are being supplied by colleges and universities. It would seem that in the majority of the cases, there is much more pre-occupation with and concern for Community Development services than curriculum. Further inquiry might be made to determine if this is actually true and if it can be possible to continue to support expanding services without the accompanying support of academic study programs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Community Development Personnel, Colleges and Universities to Which Surveys Were Sent

	INSTITUTION	LOCATION	INDIVIDUAL CONTACTED
1.	University of Alaska	College, Alaska	Dr. James W. Matthews
2.	Antioch College	Yellow Springs, Ohio	John M. Hamilton
3.	University of Arizona	Tucson, Arizona	Dr. Courtney B. Cleland
4.	Arizona State University	Tempe, Arizona	Mayland Parker
5.	Baldwin-Wallace College	Berea, Ohio	Dept. of Sociology
6.	Brandeis University	Worcester, Mass.	Charles I. Schottland
7.	University of Calif. at L.A.	Los Angeles, California	Dr. Jack D. Mezerow
8.	University of Connecticut	Storrs, Connecticut	Dr. Walter C. McKain
9.	University of California	Berkeley, California	Director, Dept. of CD
10.	University of Chicago	Chicago, Illinois	Director, Dept. of CD
11.	Chico State College	Chico, California	Lew Oliver, Div. of Soc. Sc.
12.	Columbia University Teacher's College	New York 27, N.Y.	Paul Essert
13.	Cornell University	Ithaca, New York	Dr. Robert A. Polson
14.	University of Colorado	Boulder, Colorado	Howard Higbe, Dept. of Soc. Dean D. Mack Easton, Ext.
15.	Earlham College	Richmond, Indiana	Director, Dept. of CD
16.	University of Georgia	Athens, Georgia	Dr. Harold L. Nix
17.	West Georgia State College	Carrollton, Ga.	Dr. Collus Johnson
18.	Goddard College	Plainfield, Vermont	Dean, Northwood Campus
19.	Glenville State College	Glenville, West Virginia	Walden Roush, Director
20.	University of Hawaii	Honolulu, Hawaii	Dr. Robert M. Kamins
21.	Harvard University	Cambridge, Mass.	Dept. of CD
22.	Humboldt State College	Arcata, California	William F. Murison, Dir.
23.	Illinois College	Jacksonville, Ill.	Iver J. Yeager
24.	University of Illinois	Urbana, Illinois	James G. Coke, Director
25.	Iowa State University	Ames, Iowa	Donald L. Nelson
26.	University of Iowa	Iowa City, Iowa	Robert Senecal
27.	Kansas State University	Manhattan, Kansas	Dept. of Continuing Education
28.	University of Kentucky	Lexington, Kentucky	Willis Sutten Jr.
29.	University of Maine	Orono, Maine	Dr. Robert Ayling
30.	Northern Michigan University	Marquette, Michigan	Dr. Bertis Jones
31.	University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, Michigan	Gale Jenson, Director
32.	Michigan State University	East Lansing, Michigan	Duane L. Gibson
33.	University of Minnesota	Minneapolis, Minnesota	Orville C. Peterson
34.	University of Missouri	Columbia, Missouri	Dr. Lee J. Cary
35.	University of Nebraska	Lincoln, Nebraska	Otto Hoiberg, Head CD Dept.
36.	University of New Mexico	Albuquerque, New Mexico	John Arango
37.	University of C.C. of New York	New York 3, N.Y.	Harry M. Shelman
38.	New York University	New York 3, N.Y.	Dan Dodson
39.	University of North Carolina	Chapel Hill, North Carolina	John A. Parker
40.	University of North Dakota	Grand Forks, N. Dakota	Philip A. Rognlie
41.	North Dakota State University	Fargo, North Dakota	B. B. Brandrud
42.	Ohio State University	Columbus, Ohio	Byron E. Munson
43.	Ohio University Institute of Regional Development	Athens, Ohio	J. Mason Morfit
44.	University of Oregon	Eugene, Oregon	Chairman, Dept. of Soc.
45.	University of Oklahoma	Norman, Oklahoma	Director, Center of Urban Regional Studies
46.	Pennsylvania State University	University Park, Pa.	Hugh Pyle, Asst. Director
47.	Southern Illinois University	Carbondale, Illinois	Dr. John B. Hawley, Dir.

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	INDIVIDUAL CONTACTED
48. Stanford University	Stanford, California	Dir. Com. Dev. Laboratory
49. San Bernadino Valley College	San Bernadino, California	J. W. McDaniel
50. University of Tennessee	Knoxville, Tennessee	Victor C. Holiday
51. University of Texas	Austin, Texas	Norris A. Hiett
52. University of Utah	Salt Lake City, Utah	Edward O. Moe
53. Virginia State College	Norfolk, Virginia	Dr. G. W. C. Brown
54. University of Virginia	Charlottesville, Va.	Dept. of Adult Educ.
55. Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Blacksburg, Virginia	Donald R. Fessler
56. University of Washington	Seattle 5, Washington	Director, Bureau of CD
57. Washington University	St. Louis 30, Missouri	Dr. Richard Parvis
58. Cleveland College	Cleveland, Ohio	Morris H. Cohen
59. University of Wisconsin	Madison, Wisconsin	Dr. Gordon L. Bultena
60. University of Wisconsin	Madison, Wisconsin	Dr. Marshall Clinard
61. University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee	Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Dr. Quentin F. Schenk
62. University of Wyoming	Laramie, Wyoming	Director, Dept. of CD

ERIC Clearinghouse
DEC 6 1968
on Adult Education

APPENDIX 2

Five Definitions of Community Development

I. *Background to Community Development*

In what context does Community Development operate at your school?

A. *Definition.*

1. Following are five commonly used definitions of Community Development. Which one does your department choose to accept as its guide? (Place an X in the blank preceding your choice of definition).

___a. Philippine The process by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of the government to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation and enable them to contribute fully to national progress. The distinctive feature of community development is the participation by the people themselves in efforts to improve their level of living with reliance as much as possible on their own initiative; and the provision of technical and other services in ways which encourage initiative, self-help and mutual help and make them more effective.

___b. A.I.D. Community Development is a process of social action in which the people of a community organize themselves for planning and action; define their common and individual needs and problems; make group and individual plans to meet their needs and solve their problems; execute these plans with a maximum of reliance upon community resources; and supplement these resources when necessary with services and material from governmental and non-governmental agencies outside the community.

___c. Ashridge Conference "Community Development is a movement designed to promote better living for the whole community with the active participation and on the initiative of the community."

___d. United Nations The term "community development" has come into international usage to connote the processes by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation, and to enable them to contribute fully to national progress.

___e. Cambridge Conference Community development has been described as "a movement designed to promote better living for the whole community with active participation and, if possible, on the initiative of the community, but if this initiative is not forthcoming spontaneously, by the use of techniques for arousing and stimulating it in order to secure the active and enthusiastic response to the movement."